D. REMARKS

The examiner requires new corrected drawings because the drawings are informal and contain hand-written elements. New corrected drawings are being mailed. Also, a copy of the new drawings is attached herewith.

The examiner has objected to the disclosure because of informalities. Applicants have amended the specification on page 13 to correct the calculation of Sf and to change "4A" to "4".

The examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-16 and 18-20 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikuchi et al. 5,815,160 in view of Nasserbakht et al. 6,072,443.

It should be noted that the present specification and claims refer to "presentation data" in a comparable way that Kikuchi refers to "preparation" and Nasserbakht refers to "image source". Neither Kikuchi nor Nasserbakht alters the preparation data or image source. Their inventions only affect what is finally displayed, e.g., presentation data (Kikuchi) and optics system/display between the image source and the user's face in Nasserbakht. Although "presentation data" is used by Applicant, it is clear in the context of the claim and specification that it is the "preparation data" (to use the choice of words of Kikuchi) for any given displayed presentation. Applicant's use of the term "presentation data" to mean the preparation data used in an authoring tool is distinguishable from Kikuchi's use of the term "presentation" to mean the finally displayed data.

Kikuchi discloses correcting the position and size of image data to be displayed with a similar geometrical relationship to the screen size of the display device employed for editing the scenario data (column 2, lines 46-51). The corrections are made when the image data is displayed on the presentation device (see column 3; lines 6-17; Fig. 5; column 5, beginning with line 56; column 7, lines 19-26; and column 8, lines 13-17). Kikuchi does not teach or suggest that the image size is adjusted or changed on the display device at the time of editing. As such, Kikuchi does not teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention of "determining a recommended size for the created presentation data displayed on a display screen of a computer executing a presentation authoring tool". Kikuchi also does not teach or suggest "indicating, during an authoring of a presentation, presentation data that is smaller than the recommended size." Applicant's claimed invention takes place during preparation of the presentation. Kikuchi's disclosure only addresses what happens when the prepared image is being presented on a different display. As such, the examiner has mischaracterized Kikuchi with respect to claim 1on page 3 of the Action lines 1-10. The examiner has correctly stated that Kikuchi does not disclose the elements of receiving input of an expected viewing distance and determining the recommended size based upon the expected viewing distance of the later projection having a projected data size viewable by a person, having a certain vision capability, at the expected viewing distance.

Nasserbakht et al discloses a display that can automatically adjust to the location and personal characteristics of the user (column 2, lines 18-20). Furthermore, "the image

generated by the ocular projection display 12 can be made to appear at varying distances and at varying sizes" as discussed at column 2, line 66 to column 3, line 1. The ocular projection display changes the appearance of an image source. No changes are being made to the image source itself (See Fig. 2A, Fig. 5, Fig. 6, Figs. 8, 9, and 10 and related discussion). The image source of Nasserbakht can be thought of as being comparable to the display device that would be used at the time of preparing the image, and not the display screen used for presenting the image. As such, Nasserbakht does not teach or suggest that the image size is adjusted or changed on the display device at the time of editing. As such, Nasserbakht does not teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention of "determining a recommended size for the created presentation data displayed on a display screen of a computer executing a presentation preparation authoring tool". Nasserbakht also does not teach or suggest "indicating, during an authoring of a presentation, presentation data that is smaller than the recommended size."

Since neither Kikuchi nor Nasserbakht, alone or in combination, teach or suggest these same claim limitations, the combination of the references can not make Applicant's claimed invention obvious.

With regards to claims 2, 3, 4, 6, 10, 15, 16, and 18, these claims depend from claims 1, 9 or 14 which have been shown above not to be obvious.

With regard to claims 7, 12 and 19 neither Kikuchi nor Nasserbakht teach or suggest that the preparation image or image source per se are being changed to be representative of an anticipated appearance. Neither the preparation source of Kikuchi nor

the image source of Nasserbakht are being altered. Therefore, the references, alone or in combination, do not make claims 7, 12, or 19 obvious.

With regard to claims 8, 13 and 20 the examiner states at page 6, item 10, that "Kikuchi et al. discloses that redisplaying further comprises determining a new display screen height and adjusting the second font size of the *presentation data* (emphasis added) for the new display screen height..." Again, it should be noted that Kikuchi is adjusting the *presentation data*, not the *preparation data* as distinguished throughout Kikuchi and as an example at S4 Fig. 5.

With regards to claims 5, 11 and 17, these claims depend from claims 1, 9 or 14 which have been shown above not to have been obvious.

The examiner further rejects claims 5, 11, and 17 as applied above and further in view of NedicineNet.com article "Acuity test, visual" which merely discloses the Snellen's chart. There is no teaching, motivation, or suggestion to use font height of characters on a line of a vision chart in determining the recommended font size as claimed in Applicants' claimed invention. Although Nasserbakht may indeed disclose adjusting focus to compensate for a user's near or far-sightedness, there is no teaching or suggestion as to how font height in a vision chart could be used to achieve that. The examiner is mistakenly using hindsight and the teaching of Applicant's claimed invention to find the motivation.

Applicant's Attorney has reviewed the art made of record but not relied upon. Stern et al. 6,592,223 B1 is no more relevant than the art relied upon by the examiner.

Nguyen 5,721,565 may be at least as relevant. Regardless, Nguyen does not appear to be altering the original computer image 14 Fig. 2. Like the references relied upon, Nguyen appears to be taking the unchanged "image source" 14 and causing it to be displayed differently on a device separate from the original image source.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections and the allowance of the current pending claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner feels that the pending claims could be allowed with minor changes, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to discuss an Examiner's Amendment. Applicant's Attorney requests a telephone interview with the Examiner as attached herewith.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Smith Dawkins
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 31,140
(512) 823-0094